

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/580,551	05/26/2006	Atsushi Ichibangase	062590	5980	
38834 WESTERMAI	7590 03/30/200 N. HATTORI, DANIEL	EXAM	EXAMINER		
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW			DIAZ, THOMAS C		
SUITE 700 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20036	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			3656		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/30/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/580,551	ICHIBANGASE ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
THOMAS DIAZ	3656		

	THOMAS DIAZ	3656	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 17 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following i application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(I		26(a) and the annualist	a automolom for
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp.	liance with 37 CER 41 37 must be	filed within two month	of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t         <ul> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	sideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c)   ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better — appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	Od Con attacked Nation of Nau Co		DTOL 204)
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
Mewly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		imely filed amendmen	at canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owable ii subiliitted iii a separate, i	aniely nieu amenume	it canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		I be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
/Richard WL Ridley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3656	/ Thomas Diaz/ Examiner, Art Unit 3656		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Application No. 10/580,551

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As broadly recited in the claim, Genter et al. disclose the spring receiving members or tabs (fig. 5, 74a) are pressingly inserted into the corresponding hole; within the grooves of the scissors gear and thus they are "pressingly inserted into the corresponding holes." Additionally, the limitation "pressingly inserted into the corresponding holes." Additionally, the limitation "pressingly inserted" is a product-by-process limitation. Regarding the product by process relations, even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is a beach on the product itself. The patentability of product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process, see MPEP 2113.